

STAT

900
February 20 1975

Mr. Angus Maclean Thuermer
Assistant to the Director
Central Intelligence Agency
Washington DC 20505

Dear Mr. Thuermer:

To refresh your memory of a recent exchange, I'm attaching copies.


Thought you might also be interested in the cartoon and my letter to President Ford.

I would like to pursue my support of both the CIA and the FBI and continue to write (for what they're worth) to various persons in Washington. The big problem with such activity is that the public just doesn't know the names, titles, or addresses of the people to whom they should write.

Can you give me any information? In this mornings paper I see that Representative Lucien N. Nedzi is to be chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence. I would imagine he would be a "good one" for me to write ... but what's his address? Can you help me?

With thanks for your Feb 03 note ... and best wishes to you and the CIA.

Very truly,



E. Spencer Garrett

attchmts: m1 Jan 17
yours Feb 03
m1 to the President
(with cartoon)

Incidentally ... you might be interested in knowing that your's of Feb 03 was the only acknowledgement I received to the 7-1-75 release of CIA-RDP77M00144R000500140059-1 you're all very busy ... so am I!

5 MARCH 1975

Approved For Release 2004/11/29 : CIA-RDP77M00144R000500140059-1

New JFK assassination probe sought

By Stewart Dill McBride

Staff writer of

The Christian Science Monitor

Boston

Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez (D) of Texas was riding only four cars behind the late President John F. Kennedy on the day of the assassination, Nov. 22, 1963.

And up until Watergate, the San Antonio congressman, like most Americans, was content to accept the Warren Commission conclusion that Lee Harvey Oswald was the only gunman in Dallas that day.

But now he has asked the House to create a select committee to reopen the case — on the grounds that federal intelligence agencies might have had a conspiratorial hand in the assassination.

While anticipating opposition from congressional colleagues who "either think the topic is too hot to handle or are afraid of looking ludicrous if an investigation falls through," Mr. Gonzalez is bolstered by growing numbers of Americans who want to know: "Who killed JFK?"

But Mr. Gonzalez's efforts probably will receive little support from the late President's family. At a recent

news conference, Eunice Kennedy Shriver said her family was "perfectly satisfied with the Warren report," which looked into her brother's assassination.

Still, "speculation which seemed absolutely lunatic 10 years ago — the idea that government agencies, big business, or the Mafia might be involved — now seem perfectly reasonable," said philosophy Prof. Richard Popkin of Washington University in St. Louis during a conference in Boston on "The Politics of Conspiracy."

Representative Gonzalez says his suspicions were aroused by Watergate testimony revealing what some saw as intense resentment by the Central Intelligence Agency of President Kennedy's handling of the 1961 Bay of Pigs invasion, coupled with recent reports of domestic CIA spying.

Documents link incidents?

Among the Gonzalez files — accumulated from private researchers across the country — are documents which, he says, suggest links between

the presidential assassination and the Watergate burglars.

In the working papers of Representative Gonzalez are a series of photographs supposedly taken shortly after the assassination showing three men — two of whom the Gonzalez staff claims resemble Watergate figures E. Howard Hunt and Frank Sturgis.

These photographs, in the custody of the Dallas police, reportedly show the men outside the School Book Depository Building from which Mr. Oswald was said to have fired the fatal bullet.

But more important than the new and old documents in their files, say the Gonzalez staff, is the need to examine still unanswered questions such as: Why were crucial autopsy records destroyed and some 100 documents sealed in the National Archives for 75 years for "national security"? Why did the Warren Commission, including then Rep. Gerald R. Ford of Michigan, never view crucial autopsy X-rays and photos to resolve the conflicting testimony regarding the angle and entrance points of the bullets that hit President Kennedy and Texas Gov. John B. Connally?

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

"The KGB's 'Safe House'"

Joseph Alsop's column, "The KGB's 'Safe House'" in the February 24 Washington Post asserts that "domineering and . . . left of center Senate staff aides . . . are controlling the thoughts and acts of all too many lawmakers" and constitute "a quasi-independent power bloc." This is such a self-evident proposition to Mr. Alsop that he doesn't bother to offer a shred of documentation for it.

Moreover, he says, this group—"this unknown, unseen (indeed!) power bloc" is being visited by Tass correspondents, Soviet embassy employees and others who are in reality KGB agents. The FBI has been derelict in not keeping these encounters under surveillance, and as a result the U.S. Capitol is infested with spies.

The implication is plain and nasty: anybody who is "left of center" is a potential KGB accomplice and needs to be watched.

What does Mr. Alsop mean by "left of center" anyway? People who favored the end of the Vietnam war? Those who favor detente? Arms limitation? In short, anyone who disagrees with Mr. Alsop? If that is the case, Mr. Alsop has a bigger problem than he imagines, since the majority of Americans—according to the polls—also disagree with Mr. Alsop and favor the policies cited above, and presumably need to be watched, too.

The trouble with Mr. Alsop's fantasy world is that only foreign communism

is seen as undermining our institutions. Surveillance of our legislators and their staffs by a secret, unaccountable police force is not seen as a danger; or the collection of damaging dossiers based on hearsay; or the reckless labelling of dissenters as conspirators; or the infiltration of government spies into legitimate private organizations. All of these violations of our rights to privacy, to freedom of expression and to freedom of association are airily dismissed: ". . . the foolish may credit the argument that the CIA-FBI rum-pus has uncovered a grave threat to our civil liberties."

Well, along with millions of other Americans, I do not think it is foolish to believe that violation of our fundamental constitutional rights does more to subvert our institutions than any external threat; or to believe that if the abuses of the FBI and the CIA are not exposed and checked, these secret agencies will become as powerful and repressive in the United States as the KGB is in Russia. Finally, I believe that the Congress of the United States, as the people's freely elected representatives, has the right and the duty to oversee and control the CIA and the FBI, and not, as in Mr. Alsop's upside-down and profoundly undemocratic scheme, the other way around.

Florence B. Isbell,

Executive Director,
American Civil Liberties Union,
National Capital Area.

Washington.

5 MARCH 1975

Spy vs. spy: Who will win CIA control?

*'Professors' threaten reign
of old cloak and dagger set*

By Jim Squires

Chief of Washington Bureau

Chicago Tribune Press Service

WASHINGTON—At the Central Intelligence Agency's sprawling home for spies in suburban Virginia, an elevator arrives on an upper floor and opens its doors. It's empty.

In the hallway, two agency employes watch as the elevator waits its computer-allotted time, silently closes its doors, and moves on.

"Well, there goes Angleton again," one cracks. His companion shrieks in laughter.

"ANGLETON." As the world now knows, is James Jesus Angleton, the shadowy 57-year-old American master counterspy whose forced resignation last December appeared to link him to allegedly illegal spying activities by the CIA against Americans.

For 31 years Angleton had been a key figure in the nation's intelligence community, a valued and trusted superpatriot who served his country with a brilliance and dedication matched by few others.

But had he been on that elevator, chances are that no one would have recognized him anyway. As chief of CIA counterintelligence, the enigmatic Angleton and his job were such a mystery that he was hardly more than a name in a bad joke to many of his coworkers.

THIS SHARP-FEATURED, British-mannered man with the cloak-and-dagger style is the personification of the clandestine operation—the dark side of the nation's divided intelligence house.

Both the Angleton firing and the accompanying flap over whether the agency has been operating illegally in this country are off-shoots of a much broader dispute within the highest levels of government—a dispute which pits spies against spies.

On one side are the Angletons—the agency's operators who have their roots in the "drop 'em behind the lines" days of Gen. William (Wild Bill) Donovan, whose Office of Strategic Services pioneered covert United States action against the Germans and Japanese in World War II.

On the other are the analysts, or "professors," as Angleton might call them—the researchers and policy experts who believe the CIA's principal role is to coordinate and evaluate intelligence information.

Approved For Release 2004/11/29 : CIA-RDP77M00144R000500140059-1

SINCE ITS FORMATION in 1947, the CIA has been dominated by the Donovan swash-bucklers, among them most of its directors. With the permission and most often the encouragement of U. S. Presidents, they have made clandestine operation the center of CIA existence.

The agency has fought some secret wars, started several not so secret ones, felled governments, installed its own men wherever possible, and generally poked its nose in everywhere a U. S. interest might be served.

Better known than its successes are its failures. Among them the war in Laos, the pacification program in Viet Nam, the Bay of Pigs invasion, and U. S. efforts to overthrow governments in Guatemala and Chile.

These global pursuits have invariably been conceived, charted, and carried out by the secret operations of the CIA.

SOME CIA MEN, like Gen. Edward Lansdale, whose military rank was a "cover" for true loyalties, became public men. The now-retired Lansdale, for example, is so well known for his meddling in foreign governments that his presence in an underdeveloped country is still an effective weapon in psychological warfare.

Others, like Angleton, tho just as important, are far less known. After a stint with Donovan at protecting the Italian provincial government against insurgent Communists after World War II, Angleton faded into the CIA maze to become the nation's most effective counterintelligence officer. Among his successes was uncovering evidence leading to the identification of Soviet spy Rudolf Abel in 1957.

Underlying the work of the Lansdales and the Angletons is a burning dedication to a single principle—the use of the CIA as a covert operation force with which to fight the cold war threat of Communist takeover on any and all fronts.

NOW, FOR THE FIRST time, the clandestine operators find themselves under sustained attack from the "other side" of their own house. And they have never been so vulnerable.

The clandestine side produced Watergate burglars E. Howard Hunt and James McCord. It was the clandestine side of the agency which was misused domestically by the Nixon administration. And it was for "clandestine" purposes that top agency officials lied to the Congress about its role in the affairs of the Chilean government.

"Now that we're in trouble, the professors are trying to destroy us," complained one ranking clandestine official recently. "We have always lived under one set of rules and the overt people have lived under another. If we are forced to live by their rules, it will put us out of business—which is exactly what they want to do."

HUNDRED INTO THE enemy-professor category are such divergent personalities as author Victor Marchetti, a former CIA analyst who has written a book critical of clandestine action; Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger, a former CIA director; and Ray S. Cline, a former deputy director of the CIA and State Department analyst who is a vocal critic of past and present intelligence policy, especially as practiced by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. While Cline, Schlesinger, and Marchetti are unlikely conspiratorial partners in any endeavors, they all agree that the intelligence operations of the government badly needs reforming.

The spate of books and articles critical of the CIA and the flood of newspaper accounts of clandestine activity are all regarded by the old OSS troops as thinly veiled attacks by their enemies.

CIA DIRECTOR William Colby, while a product of the clandestine services, is labeled by his former associates as a turncoat who has sided with the other side out of political expediency.

He has been roundly condemned inside and outside the intelligence community for firing Angleton simultaneously with published reports that linked him to domestic spying activities.

Ironically, most intelligence sources agree that Colby had decided to fire Angleton long ago, mainly because the old warrior had failed to accept the policy of detente with the Soviet Union and softening U. S. stands toward the Arabs. Angleton's hardline policies, the sources contend, had led to repeated confrontations with Colby over the handling of Israeli intelligence operations with whom Angleton had long been the liaison.

"ANGLETON WAS SIMPLY a symbol of the Old Boy, OSS clandestine operator who had refused to change with the times," explained one insider. "Colby wanted his own man in that job. By removing Angleton when he did, he let it be known that the agency is changing."

"I think Colby is handling things rather well. He's got to push what is good about the agency, and what is good is its capability for research and analysis."

Colby, himself, has complained that public attacks on the agency and that many congressional probes are endangering the life of the CIA as an intelligence-gathering apparatus. Because of the threat posed by Congress and the press, he says, the agency's foreign sources may dry up, rather than risk having their information or their identities leaked by the CIA.

DESPITE DIFFERENCES among themselves, the nation's spies—both overt and covert—agree that the agency is in trouble.

To help analyze the situation and recommend steps to correct it, a group of retired agency employes have been called back to work in a consulting capacity.

One of them is James Jesus Angleton, covert operator extraordinaire. Wild Bill Donovan would have applauded the decision.

5 MARCH 1975

AFRICA**AFRICAN STATES PROTEST
KISSINGER APPOINTEE**

Foreign ministers of 43 member states of the Organization of African Unity meeting in the Ethiopian capital of Addis Ababa adopted a resolution last week opposing the nomination of Nathaniel Davis as U.S. Undersecretary of State for African Affairs. Davis was ambassador to Chile at the time of the CIA-instigated coup against the Popular Unity government of Salvador Allende, and it is widely assumed that Davis, as top U.S. official in Chile, supervised the U.S. "destabilization" operations there. The OAU resolution marks a new step forward for African unity against U.S. imperialism. The Africans' diplomatic drive against Davis was launched Jan. 24 by Zaire President Mobutu Sese Seko at an African-American conference in the Zaire capital, Kinshasa, with a pointed criticism of Davis' "destabilizing" mission.

In another OAU development, the organization's foreign ministers recommended Feb. 17 that member states should now feel free to establish diplomatic relations with Portugal in view of the independence agreement reached recently with Angola. The recommendation marks the end of the OAU's diplomatic boycott of Portugal.

House CIA Panel Salted with Leftists

The House of Representatives has established a Select Committee on Intelligence to conduct an inquiry into the operations of various super-secret U.S. government agencies, but there are many who are concerned that some far-left and extremely dovish



HARRINGTON

DELLUMS

lawmakers are sitting on this panel and will have access to highly sensitive material.

The committee, for instance, is authorized to inquire into the activities of the National Security Council; the U.S. Intelligence Board; the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board; the Central Intelligence Agency; the Defense Intelligence Agency; and the intelligence components of the Departments of the Army, Navy and the Air Force.

The committee is also authorized to probe the

super-sensitive National Security Agency, the Intelligence and Research Bureau of the State Department and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Among other things, the committee may require, by subpoena or otherwise, "the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers and documents as it deems necessary."

Yet the committee is filled with representatives of the militant left. Rep. Ronald Dellums (D.-Calif.), for instance, is one of the ten members. Dellums, as HUMAN EVENTS has reported in the past, has been a leading supporter of left-wing revolutionaries, including the Black Panthers and pro-Communist outfits in the United States that have been artfully contriving to turn over South Vietnam to Hanoi.

When Dellums first ran for Congress in 1970, he was an open supporter of the Panthers, whose leaders and publications were then calling for the assassination of American leaders. Dellums has been a backer of Communist Angela Davis. When the Communist-dominated World Conference on Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia concluded a two-day session in Stockholm, Sweden, three years ago, guess who turned up as a U.S. delegate?

Rep. Michael Harrington (D.-Mass.), another supporter of far-left causes, is also a member of this extremely sensitive panel. Yet Harrington has been an open supporter of Communist causes. In December of last year, Harrington, for instance, was a special guest of the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee which honored pro-Hanoi and pro-Communist radicals, Jane Fonda and Tom Hayden. The committee, described by the House Committee on Internal Security as "communist controlled," presented the "Tom Paine" award to both Fonda and Hayden for their efforts in trying to cut off all U.S. military and economic aid to South Vietnam and Cambodia. The NECLS is chaired by long-time Soviet apologist Corliss Lamont, and has as its general counsel Leonard B. Boudin, a fervent supporter of Communist and radical causes.

1 MARCH 1975

Approved For Release 2004/11/29 : CIA-RDP77M00144R000500140059-1

Doubtful company

THE REAL SPY WORLD

By Miles Copeland.

*Weidenfeld and Nicolson. 351 pages.
£3.50.*

The CIA is in bad odour these days. Unlike many of his ex-colleagues who exploit their inside knowledge of "the Company" by fresh and sensational disclosures, Miles Copeland actually rallies to its defence. Not in any officially inspired or romantic spirit, but by leading us deep into the "special and private world" of intelligence (of which espionage proper—or improper—forms only a part), explaining, assessing and generally justifying.

Mr Copeland is no ordinary guide. A former officer of the wartime Office of Strategic Services, he played an important part in setting up the CIA, became a competent Arabist and one-time adviser to President Nasser, hobnobbed with Philby ("I knew him as well as anyone did"), and matched his wits against, and even conceived a personal liking for, his Russian counterparts ("a friend of mine in the KGB office in Cairo . . ."). He has combined a career in intelligence with those of international business consultant, jazz musician and author.

For all its picturesque detail and anecdotes (sometimes doctored so as not to compromise operations or techniques still on the secret list) this is an informative and sobering book.

It tells us much about the origins and organisation of the CIA, the various categories of agents used on both sides, their motives, methods of recruitment and operation and their career prospects. Jobs are apparently easier to get with Soviet intelligence than with the CIA. For the former "pay is good and steady"; probably not more than three out of ten Soviet agents get caught, and of those who do, a few get off fairly lightly, though others "die of the measles" in circumstances "that are so terrifying as to defy description". The CIA's agents are mostly citizens of eastern block countries, many of them in government or party posts. Most curious of all is the allegedly large category of informants who believe they are working for an industrial body, crusading newspaper or other organisation, but are in reality being manipulated by some intelligence service.

Mr Copeland describes the "alternative means" for gathering intelligence which range from minuscule microphones to the sophisticated scrutiny of scientific journals, official directories and so on and the brain which collates this plethora of information—the data bank. The CIA has become "the world's repository of political, sociological, economic, military and scientific data". "Octopus", the computerised files held at the CIA's headquarters at Langley, Virginia, is proving an effective weapon for detecting terrorists and hijackers, as well as enemy agents. But Mr Copeland predicts that, by the time the present drive for data is completed, its tentacles will hold "a file of some kind on practically every person in the world who in any way comes to the official notice of his own government or of the US Government".

VIEWPOINT

Boston Herald American—Wednesday, Feb. 26, 1975—P.

A Warning to Heed

William E. Colby, director of the beleaguered Central Intelligence Agency, last week gave Congress a grim warning of the damage already done to national security operations by what he called "exaggerated" press allegations—and the potential future damage inherent in pending probes by publicity-seeking Washington lawmakers.

Both the Senate and the House, heavily dominated by the Democratic party, have established Watergate-type select committees soon to begin quasi-public investigations of the CIA, the FBI and all other hush-hush government agencies. With revealing significance, the House committee has allotted only three of its 10 seats to Republicans.

In rare public testimony before a House Appropriations subcommittee, Colby undertook to deny charges in *The New York Times* and elsewhere that the CIA conducted "massive illegal domestic intelligence operations." Admitting that some minor stretching of the CIA charter may have occurred in pursuing possible foreign links to American dissidents, Colby nevertheless insisted:

"It was neither massive, illegal nor (fundamentally) domestic, as charged. All our operations were made at presidential directive and under authority of the National Security Act."

This admittedly real consideration, he went on, was negligible when compared with the harm done to national security operations by what he termed "hysterical" charges against the agency.

Already, he said, CIA relations with intelligence groups in allied nations have been

jeopardized, the lives of American spies on dangerous missions abroad have been imperilled and CIA morale in general has been lowered dangerously.

"These last two months have placed American intelligence in danger," Colby said. "Exaggeration and misrepresentations of CIA activities do irreparable harm to our intelligence apparatus. If carried to the extreme, (they) would blindfold our country as it looks ahead."

What the director clearly suggested was that the forthcoming select committee probes, with their built-in danger of private-session leaks, are a dandy way of serving the curiosity of Moscow spies far more than the interests of the American people. In a competitive, war-threatened world, even democracies are obliged to have self-protective secrets—or else.

Like CIA Director Colby, we view the impending Senate and House inquiries with both resignation and trepidation. Congress has a perfect right to pursue the planned probes—which, incidentally, are supposed to go on quietly all the time as part of its budget control responsibility. It is the specter of politics vs. security which is so alarming.

Sometimes—when especially discouraged—it is possible to view some of the decisions of our national legislators as not only self-serving but self-defeating. We fear that the Hippodrome probes of national security agencies now looming may well fall into both categories.

Liberals Forced Angleton Out

James Angleton, a patriotic public servant has been forced to resign from the C.I.A. because of mounting pressure from the liberal news media. I hope that after 31 years of service he should be rewarded in some way. The Republic needs the CIA now more than ever.

T.P.F.
Belmont

BOSTON HERALD

24 February 1975

★ Philip Agee, the former CIA agent who has written a blistering "expose" of the agency, concedes that he is now a "supporter" of the Castro revolution. That is putting it mildly. A defector from the Cuban intelligence service has given secret congressional testimony spelling out Agee's links with the Castro regime.

★ In listing hundreds of CIA agents and their Latin American contacts, Agee has, in effect, signed their death warrants. Columnist Jack Anderson reported last week that in Uruguay, a taxi driver whose name appeared in Agee's book stopped at a traffic light. Another car pulled alongside him and an assailant emptied a pistol at the taxi. Miraculously, the driver escaped injury.

FoI amendments

The amendments to the 1966 Freedom of Information Act passed by Congress over President Ford's veto, became effective last week. Theoretically it requires most federal agencies to honor all requests for documentation on file excepting those involving national security.

The FBI has already listed the exceptions it will take (Feb. 22, page 18) and noted the FoI Act is in conflict with the "Privacy Act of 1974. Other government agencies undoubtedly will develop their own series of objections. It remains to be seen, therefore, how effective the new act will be. It also depends upon how aggressive news media are in applying the Act to obtain information.

In connection with this and related issues of freedom of information—censorship, gag orders, shield laws, and a host of others—we want to put in a plug for the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press in Washington D.C. Its "Press Censorship Newsletter" is a compendium of up to date reports on cases in these areas. Volume VI just released contains 77 pages of 316 indexed summaries. The committee also provides legal advice and has arranged legal representation in some cases on a pro-bono publico basis by law firms. The committee needs financial support from the newspaper business to continue and merits it, in our opinion.

THE CIA - HAS IT GONE TOO FAR?

Recent criticism of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) has led to the appointment of a Presidential and a Senate committee to investigate allegations of wrong-doing by the CIA.

The CIA was alleged to have illegally investigated the affairs of American citizens during the Vietnam war. The investigations were alleged to be illegal because the CIA's charter specifies that it is limited to intelligence gathering operations outside the U.S. The CIA maintained surveillance and kept files on many U.S. citizens instead of leaving it up to the FBI. They tapped phones and opened letters illegally because the CIA had tried to find out whether or not there was any connection between the domestic anti-war protest movement and foreign intelligence operations.

This is where the allegations are debatable. The question is, even though these activities took place in the U.S. were they partly influenced by foreign intelligence operations in the country? And were the civil rights of U.S. citizens violated without adequate justification? These are the things the committee was supposed to determine. But it would be wise to withhold judgement on the CIA's behavior until the reports of these committees have been completed and carefully examined.

Peter Cromwell
5th grade

31 JAN 1975

Approved For Release 2004/11/29 : CIA-RDP77M00144R000500140059-1

Has CIA infiltrated office of women voters' league?

A former secretary for the Overseas Education Fund (OEF) of the League of Women Voters in Washington, D.C. claims the C.I.A. has infiltrated the OEF for the purpose of "neutralizing" the women's movement.

Another critic of the CIA, ex-agent Victor Marchetti, will speak today (admission free) in the HUB Ballroom at 2 p.m. on further CIA activities in his only Seattle speaking engagement.

"I believed the function of the OEF to be to sponsor programs for self-help to assist women in Latin America and in Asia," said Ann Roberts, a Seattle woman who began working for the OEF last July.

"During the course of my employment at OEF and from what I have learned subsequently," she said, "it became clear to me that the CIA provided funds which, under the auspices of the OEF, went to people to conduct investigations of feminist organizations in Latin America and Asia.

"A scheme was set up whereby an individual, traveling abroad for the OEF, was asked to collect information about the size, strength, politics and future directions of women's organizations and groups abroad.

"That person would then turn the information over to a CIA operative abroad."

It is now clear, Roberts said, that the CIA considers the feminist movement to be a force to be investigated, infiltrated and controlled.

"The CIA desires to keep a close watch on the women's

movement and neutralize it as it approaches its goal of achieving social change," she said.

"I have made these CIA practices known because I resent having the women's movement used in this way and because the policies and actions of the CIA are abhorrent not only to me, but to concerned people in this country and throughout the world.

"It is perhaps a sign of the strength of the women's movement that the CIA considers it a force to be infiltrated and spied upon.

"But it is now incumbent upon those in positions of responsibility within domestic feminist groups to scrutinize closely their government funding, to analyze possible ways the CIA may have infiltrated their organizations and to come forward immediately to expose any and all CIA involvement in their organization."

Why the CIA will tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth to keep its secrets

It is usually dangerous to make early predictions about the outcome of governmental investigations, especially when their subject has been cloaked in secrecy and then further obscured by masses of published misinformation, but the current witch-hunt against the Central Intelligence Agency may prove an exception.

Already, Washington's insiders think they see how it will come out. It seems to be pointing to a surprise ending like those of Agatha Christie's murder mysteries. The chief suspects may turn out to have been accomplices of the detectives and the characters who were such honest chaps in early parts of the books are turning out to have been the villains.

Here, in an only slightly oversimplified summary, is the emerging scenario:

➤ Having no member who is a "champion of civil liberties", the President's "blue ribbon commission" will be unable to provide findings acceptable to the Congressmen and crusading journalists who are attacking the CIA—although, for what it is worth, the findings will be acceptable to the large majority of American people. As those of us who have recently toured the country promoting books about the CIA learned, the interest of America's "silent majority" in this subject is one of curiosity rather than worry—and, anyway, there is little

earning for a "champion of civil liberties" in a country where the likes of Daniel Ellsberg, Victor Marchetti and Philip Agee can win fame and fortune by exposing the secrets of the very agency against which the championing is to be done.

In any case, how the great American public feels about the CIA is at the moment of little concern to those who are out to "get" it. So is the fact that in Britain or any other country in the world those who expose the secrets of the nation's intelligence organization wind up behind bars.

➤ Because the blue ribbon commission has on it no "champion of civil liberties" and is composed exclusively of senior citizens whose discretion and integrity is above question, agency members and alumni will tell it the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the

truth. "We're going to give them the truth about everything", an old colleague told me, "even about matters they won't know to bring up. By the time we're through with them they will have had the most thorough cram course on the CIA anyone has ever had—on what the Agency is supposed to do, what the dangers are of our not doing it, and what we are doing, good, bad and indifferent."

There will be no "withholding of information", the whole point of the exercise being to give commission members total confidence in their findings. When the blue ribbon hearings are over, the CIA will have as allies a group of men with tremendous prestige and power, representing a cross section of American society and having such a depth of understanding of the Agency's affairs and problems that they can relieve CIA witnesses of the burden of deciding, for themselves, what should and what should not be revealed to later investigating committees.

➤ Thus, when it comes time to face the congressional committees, Agency members will unhesitatingly "withhold information"—or even lie outright—when, with the backing of their new allies, they feel it is in the public interest that they do so. "Suppose", an Agency member said to me, "I am asked by someone on Senator Church's committee if it is true that such-and-such an Arab leader is secretly cooperating with us to bring about an Arab-Israeli peace, should I tell him the truth? If I say 'Yes' or 'Sorry, but that's secret information' there'll be newspaper headlines the next day which will end the cooperation, destroy the poor Arab, and teach other Arab leaders the unwisdom of cooperating with Americans. So if I'm asked a question like that I'll lie in my teeth, and consider I'm doing my patriotic duty."

➤ Even with the CIA's wit-

nesses "withholding information", Congressional investigators will get enough information on dangers to the nation to make them wonder if they've not been fretting over the wrong questions. They will be briefed on the increased technical capabilities of terrorist groups, "sleepers" in our transportation systems, public utilities and ports who could paralyse the nation's military capabilities in the event of any showdown with Russia, and on other means by which "the opposition" hopes to achieve the Leninist goal: "Do not attack until you have removed the enemy's capacity for counter-attack."

Agency briefers whose records establish them as cold-blooded analysts, rather than fanatical cold warriors, will also convey to the Congressmen an understanding of another point: the "Leninoid demonology" requires "a CIA". If one didn't exist, it would have to be created. By coincidence or design, the pattern of attacks on the CIA is exactly what it would be were it the result of a master scheme. In these days of "upside down McCarthyism" one dares not say such things publicly for fear of being called a "fanatical cold warrior", and the Congressmen to whom I suggested that the Agency might just possibly be right on this point instantly replied that it was "hysterical nonsense".

My Agency friends assure me, though, that even the most sceptical Congressmen will change their tune in the course of the briefings.

➤ In any case, with respect to what the Agency has done, abroad or domestically, this realization is going to strike the Congressional investigators: all of it would have had the full approval of any Congressional "watchdog" committee which might conceivably have existed. There would have been but one difference: instead of the CIA's being all alone in its current troubles it would have had the company of the Congressmen on the committee.

Such a realization is bound to dampen the Congressmen's enthusiasm for abandoning secrecy laws and relaxing the security screenings of civil servants having access to official secrets. Once he learns what sort of activities he may be called upon to cooperate in

Congressman in his right mind would serve on a watchdog committee unless he is assured that the secrets which will inevitably come his way have complete security protection—even if this means surveillances sometimes border on "spying". Moreover, as the result of the briefings they will get, the Congressional investigators will recognize "community surveillance" as an inescapable need, and they will regard the question of whether or not the CIA should have any part in it as constructionist and trifling.

Their distaste for it, however, may cause them to insist that it be entirely in the hands of an agency with these qualifications: ability to operate efficiently and inconspicuously, lack of police powers or other powers which might cause it to develop into a Gestapo, and means of storing information so securely that it cannot be leaked to outsiders who might misuse it. An American "MI5" in other words. "Unfortunately", an old Agency man told the blue ribbon commission, "the CIA fills the bill better than the FBI".

So what, when we get right down to it, has the fuss been all about? My friends in Langley are convinced that this is the real question. Agency officials concede that the *New York Times*'s Seymour Hersh is motivated by nothing more sinister than a desire to get ahead of his *Washington Post* rivals and win himself a Pulitzer Prize, but they think he and others may have been caught up in that "master scheme" they will be telling the blue ribbon commission and the Congressional committees about. This is at least a possibility worth considering.

Miles Copeland

The author's book on the CIA, *The Real Spy World*, is published this week by Weidenfeld and Nicolson, price £3.50.
© Times Newspapers Ltd, 1975

Colby hits back at CIA's detractors

From our own Correspondent, Washington, Feb. 20

Mr William Colby, the director of Central Intelligence, today roundly attacked the "hysteria" and the "exaggeration and misrepresentation" which, he claimed, surrounded recent reporting of the CIA. He said such reporting could do "irreparable damage" to vital American intelligence work.

In particular, Mr Colby told a Congressional subcommittee, unjustified attacks on the CIA could "blindfold our country." His agency had overstepped its bounds from time to time, but the reaction to these incidents that were "few and far between," was placing the agency in serious danger.

The CIA director's denunciation of the press, some members of Congress, and some former members of the Nixon Administration, came less than a day after the House of Representatives had voted to create a special committee — similar to the Church committee in the Senate — to investigate the entire US intelligence community.

There is a possibility the two bodies will combine, thereby forming an extremely powerful joint select committee. The distinct chance that an examination of the CIA by such

a body could harm the operations of the agency must have been in Mr Colby's mind when he spoke out so sharply this afternoon.

His attacks were specific as well as general. He attacked the New York Times reporter who wrote the December 22 article alleging "massive illegal domestic intelligence operations" by the CIA. Mr Colby said this writer was guilty of "mixing and magnifying" both those legal activities of the CIA and those "few activities that may have been illegal" into a "highly exaggerated" report.

Mr Colby also came down hard on Mr Charles Colson, the felon-turned-zealot of the Nixon team who has accused the CIA of all manner of criminal activities.



Donald Morris /an analysis

File flap misses mark

If there is a concept common to all threads of the current uproar over intelligence agencies, it is the subject of "files."

The FBI is charged with maintaining files on congressmen, the CIA with opening files on "10,000" American citizens, the Houston police with "criminal intelligence" files, the military services with "secret code numbers" in otherwise unclassified files, credit bureaus and educational institutions with collecting unevaluated material. The very idea of a file on us, unbeknownst to us or holding material we are unaware of, disquiets us to the point of frenzy.

But there are two quite discrete principles involved and, as is all too often the case, we are venting our ire on the wrong one. The first principle is the mere existence of files, for any purpose, and containing any material, and the second is the misuse of what a file contains.

File information can be misused (although not as easily as most people think), and no safeguard against such misuse can be too strong. But simply jumping to the conclusion that the best safeguard against misuse is to abolish files is like saying the best way to stop traffic deaths is to abolish automobiles.

No enterprise, private or public, can budge without personnel files. All projects involve people, and people must be selected, trained, assigned, transferred, evaluated, promoted, licensed, paid, issued or barred from credit, bought from, sold to and discharged — and (human nature being what it is) investigated for actual and even potential wrong-doing. Every last one of these functions is for the benefit of society as a whole, and in almost all cases for the benefit of the individual as well. And not a one of them can be

started without a personnel file.

America, which has developed organizational techniques beyond any other country, is rather good at such management.

We are perhaps the only country with a literature on such esoteric subjects as "Information Retrieval", "Records Management" and the like, and most of our large institutions, public and private, have branches concerned only with records management, without any concern for what they contain. And I have worked with governments where a document is apt to vanish from the face of the earth the instant it leaves the typewriter, to be located again (if at all) only by a painful and protracted hunt down the line for the person who saw it last.

These files, by their nature, will contain what is usually referred to as "derogatory" information, and the functions they support cannot possibly be carried on without it. Any evaluation for the approval of responsibility — the issuance of a license, granting of credit, selecting for a position — is only as good as the file it is based on.

We may not like it if a history of mild diabetes or heart trouble bars us from a pilot's license, if a few months as a "slow pay" prevents us from securing a charge plate, or drinking habits lose us a job we want. We would like it a lot less if these functions — from which we all benefit — were not carried out.

Files, no matter how necessary, are a nuisance to maintain, and those that do make decided efforts to eliminate "garbage" — which is any material not relevant to the purpose for which the file was established.

Those concerned with files containing derogatory materi-

al also take stringent steps to prevent their misuse, for obvious reasons. The existence of such files implies the possibility of misuse, but this does not equate automatically with the likelihood of misuse and, in fact, in all the present brouhaha there has not been the slightest evidence of misuse by anyone — simply the charges that files were opened and maintained.

The investigative process, uncomfortable as it makes us, is a necessity in all manner of aspects of the national life. Our concern should be focused on the misuse of file information, not on their mere existence.

Bob Wiedrich

25 FEB 1975
Approved For Release 2004/11/29 : CIA-RDP77M00144R000500140059-1

Committee takes the vow of silence



WELL, NOW the circle is complete.

The House has created a select committee to investigate whether the Central Intelligence Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigation violated individual rights thru alleged domestic spying. The action rounds out the efforts of a similar Senate committee and a special White House commission chaired by Vice President Nelson Rockefeller.

Verily. This is the year to investigate the investigators.

Let us hope, tho, that these sensitive areas are plumbed with good judgment and proper regard for national security, however in disrepute that term may have fallen during the Nixon Watergate years.

For it continues to have considerable impact on the well-being of the United States in crucial times.

AND THAT is why it is encouraging to learn the House Select Committee to be headed by Rep. Lucien Nedzi [D., Mich.] has pledged not to compromise or jeopardize the secrecy of matters vital to the safety of the country.

Specifically, committee members have imposed a vow on themselves not to divulge national security data about intelligence gathering.

They have also promised that no committee or staff members will be permitted to enrich themselves by writing articles or making speeches for profit, nor shall they disclose specific information about specific individuals.

That rule alone should help prevent a repeat performance of the three-ring circus staged last year by the Senate Watergate and House Judiciary Committees when a combination of leaked information and the lecture circuit too often turned a serious business into a tragically irresponsible charade.

The main thing is to get these federal agencies back where they belong, out of politics, and restore public confidence in them. If there have been improper uses of the CIA and FBI, let them be bared and actions taken to correct them.

But let the committees of the Congress and the Vice President conduct their inquiries with common sense and the degree of restraint necessary to safeguard the operations of the agencies under fire.

These need not be adversary proceedings. There will be men of good conscience and good motives on both sides of the investigatory tables.

Just conduct the inquiries in a professional manner and keep the rhetoric and partisan pot shots to a minimum.

That is why it is also heartening to hear that the House Select Committee intends to explore the possibility of political manipulation of federal agencies in previous administrations, too. There is a responsibility for committee members to play it square. Obviously, they recognize it.

This is, after all, an investigation for the people of the United States, not one for partisan advantage. Nor, for that matter, is it one designed to cripple the agencies.

During the course of the hearings, there will be much sensitive material produced for the committees, both domestic and international in scope. There will be the possibility of placing lives or covert operations in jeopardy. The potential for harm to the nation's cause will be great if there are leaks.

For spying is a dangerous game, an often lethal one. It is one thing to read a spy novel. It is another to be involved in the craft. And as distasteful as the profession may be to many civil libertarians, it is vital in maintaining United States security.

If some have been overzealous, then let that be learned. If there has been political interference or misuse of the agencies, let that also be bared.

However, let not the missions of dedicated men, risking their lives for their country in the pursuit of intelligence information here and abroad, be compromised by grandstand plays.

THE CIA, since its creation after World War II, has never been seriously surveyed by Congress. No one knows exactly what it spends or how or why. A searching, responsible look is in order. The same goes for any of the investigative agencies that should always be accountable to Capitol Hill as representative of the American people. None is inviolate.

The House and Senate Committees, along with the Rockefeller commission, can make a substantial contribution to the country thru their investigations.

The agencies are important to the national security. Their roles must be unencumbered by political interference. That is why they must be restored to an eye-to-eye level with the public—and as quickly as possible.